

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

CATHERINE KOSLOVER,

Plaintiff,

v.

**PRAIRIE BAND TRIBAL COURT,
et al.,**

Defendants.

Case No. 16-CV-4061-DDC-KGS

ORDER

On May 31, 2016, Magistrate Judge K. Gary Sebelius issued a Report and Recommendation (Doc. 7), recommending dismissal of this lawsuit for several reasons: (1) it fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, and thus dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) is appropriate; (2) plaintiff is seeking monetary relief against those immune from such relief, and thus dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii) is appropriate; and (3) the court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims, and Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1) requires dismissal of the action.

Judge Sebelius noted in his Report and Recommendation that plaintiff may serve and file objections to the Report and Recommendation under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, within 14 days after service. Doc. 7 at 6. He also advised plaintiff that failing to make a timely objection to the Report and Recommendation waives any right to appellate review of the proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, or recommended disposition. *See id.* (explaining that “[i]f no objections are timely filed, no appellate review will be allowed by any court.”). The Clerk sent a copy of the Report and Recommendation to plaintiff by certified mail. *See* Docket

Entry for Doc. 7 (stating “[a] copy of this order was sent to plaintiff by certified mail (Tracking No. 7010 2780 0003 1927 6829).”).

Service of the Report and Recommendation was accomplished by “mailing it to [plaintiff’s] last known address—in which event service [was] complete upon mailing.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(C); *see also ReVoal v. Brownback*, No. 14-4076, 2014 WL 5321093, at *1 (D. Kan. Oct. 16, 2014). That mailing occurred on May 31, 2016, when the Clerk mailed the Report and Recommendation to plaintiff. *See* Doc. 7. The time for plaintiff to file any objections to the Report and Recommendation thus has expired.¹

To date, plaintiff has filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation, nor has she sought any extension of time to file an objection. Because plaintiff has filed no objection to the Report and Recommendation within the time prescribed, and she has sought no extension of time to file an objection, the Court accepts, adopts, and affirms the Report and Recommendation in its entirety.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that, after reviewing the file *de novo*, the Report and Recommendation issued by United States Magistrate Judge K. Gary Sebelius on May 31, 2016 (Doc. 7) is **ACCEPTED, ADOPTED and AFFIRMED**. The Court dismisses this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii), and Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 21st day of June, 2016, at Topeka, Kansas

s/ Daniel D. Crabtree
Daniel D. Crabtree
United States District Judge

¹ Plaintiff’s deadline for responding is extended by three days under Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), because service was made by mail. Even adding these three additional days to the 14-day response time, the deadline for responding to Judge Sebelius’ Report and Recommendation has expired.